

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated December 15, 2003.

The applicant has noted the objection to the specification, particularly as mentioned in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, and has amended the specification responsive thereto.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection/objection to the specification is requested.

Substantively, claims 1-6 and 8 stand rejected on grounds of obviousness over Stout (4,822,157) in view of Falge (1,768,354). Reconsideration is requested in view of the amendments to the claims herein and the following remarks.

The mirror assembly of claim 1 is of a particular type which is specifically suited to provide a view along the front and at least one side of a school bus vehicle.

The outer surface of the mirror element is convex and generally dome-shaped. This type of mirror surface is needed for obtaining coverage of a certain viewing zone, which is quite important, in view of the fact the these types of mirrors are used on school buses where child safety is involved. Automotive mirrors are often treated with anti-glare materials and a compromise is made between obtaining the maximum brightness of the image and the desire to suppress glare that may result from any source.

In accordance with the preferred embodiment of the invention, the anti-glare treatment of the present invention commences at an uppermost position on the contoured mirror surface and ends at a curved line, which curves relative to the straight bisecting line, for example, as shown in Fig. 2A of the instant specification.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record does not teach the instant invention. The Falge reference, applicant continues to maintain, is actually two mirrors.

Respectfully, the prior art does not show the invention of claim 1, particularly as amended herein. In Falge, a lower portion of an upper one-third of the mirror is treated. This is in contrast to present invention, where the treated surface begins from the periphery and proceeds downward, rather than in the other direction. The remaining claims in the application depend from claim 1 and impose further limitations thereon which distance them even more apart from the prior art of record. Accordingly, it is believed that all of the claims in the application distinguish over the prior art and merit allowance.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 5, 2004:

Max Moskowitz

Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative

Signature

March 5, 2004

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Max Moskowitz

Registration No.: 30,576

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700